



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,309	12/21/2001	Flora P. Goldthwaite	MSFT-0741/188840.1	6541
41505	7590	12/15/2004	EXAMINER	
WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103			NGUYEN, LE V	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
DATE MAILED: 12/15/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/032,309

Applicant(s)

Goldthwaite et al.

Examiner

Le Nguyen

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference character(s) mentioned in the description: 10 and/or 110 (lines 1 and 22 of page 7, lines 5-8 and 11-12 of page 10) as well as 11 of line 20 of page 10. Corrected drawing sheets are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

2. The specification is objected to because they do not describe the following reference character(s) depicted in the drawings:

- a) 135(a-e) of fig. 1A; and
- b) 230b of fig. 6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 9-18, 21, 22, 25-33, 36, 37 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Moran et al. ("Moran").

As per claim 1, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, comprising selecting a time period of interest on the timeline (fig. 17; section [0232]; *selection via indicator 1703*) and displaying from the user's digital history store on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interests, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith (figs. 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0198], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *displaying a timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period selected wherein the icon may be in the form of a thumbnail*).

As per claim 2, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including displaying in a navigation region a root navigation region displaying icons for events, people, places and things (figs. 13, 14, 16

and 17; sections [0198], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *root navigation regions such as 1400, 1601 and 1701*) and in response to selecting one of the events, people, places and things icons in the root navigation region, displaying a cluster of one of events, people, places and things corresponding to the selection and relating to the time period of interest (fig. 16; section [0229]; *upon selection of one of the icons in the root navigation region, the timeline interface is updated to show all event related to the selection*).

As per claim 5, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to selecting one of the elements of the cluster, displaying a sub-cluster of elements of which the cluster is comprised, wherein the sub-cluster of elements relate to the time period of interest ((fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 6, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein selecting in the navigating region includes displaying in a path display portion a currently navigated path by the user from root region to individual elements, including intervening selected clusters (section [0186]).

As per claim 9, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes inputting user preference information for pre-specified aspects of said displaying (sections [0204] and [0229]).

As per claim 10, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to a user selection, displaying additional information about the displayed icons (fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 11, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein the time period of interest is selected from one of a range of at least one hour, a range of at least one day, a range of at least one week, a range of at least one month and a range of at least one year (figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

As per claims 12 and 13, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said selecting a time period of interest includes scoping to a time period of interest with a scoping mechanism and wherein the scoping mechanism is a scroll bar (figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

Claims 14-17 and 30-32 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 18 and 33 are individually similar in scope to claim 2 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 21 and 36 are individually similar in scope to claim 5 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 22 and 37 are individually similar in scope to claim 6 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 25 and 40 are individually similar in scope to claim 9 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 26 and 41 are individually similar in scope to claim 10 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 27 and 42 are individually similar in scope to claim 11 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 28 and 29, in combination, is similar in scope to the combination of claims 12 and 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 43 and 44, in combination, is similar in scope to the combination of claims 12 and 13 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 3, 4, 19, 20, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella").

As per claim 3, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship (sections [0202], [0235] and [0243]), Moran does not explicitly disclose the relationship being one of (1) recency of activity associated therewith, (2) frequency of activity associated therewith and (3) user preferences. Sciammarella teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on

elements based upon recency of activity associated therewith (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Sciammarella's teaching of placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity to Moran's teaching of placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship so that a temporal relationship among the elements would be clearly visible to a viewer.

As per claim 4, the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said placing emphasis includes at least one of changing the size of the icon, changing a contrast associated with the icon and positioning the icon according to a direction of emphasis (Sciammarella: figs. 1-3).

Claims 19 and 34 are individually similar in scope to claim 3 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 20 and 35 are individually similar in scope to claim 4 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 7, 23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Fernandes.

As per claim 7, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes a drag-and-drop operation, i.e. dragging an element from one region to another, and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection (figs. 11, 13, 14 and 16-20; section [0047]), Moran does not explicitly disclose dragging an element from the navigation region to a filter

region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element. Fernandes teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element (fig. 3; col. 12, lines 7-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes' teaching of dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element to Moran's teaching of dragging an element from one region to another and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

Claims 23 and 38 are individually similar in scope to claim 7 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 8, 24 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran").

As per claim 8, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in the timeline (section [0128]), Moran does not explicitly disclose inputting text to a query input portion. Official Notice is taken that inputting text to a query input portion to extract data is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include inputting text to a query input portion to extract data to Moran's teaching of providing input for querying a database and in response to the

input, filtering the elements displayed in order to provide users with an alternative or additional input means.

Claims 24 and 39 are individually similar in scope to claim 8 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Prabhu et al. (US 2002/0075310 A1) teach a GUI adapted to allow scene content annotation of groups of pictures in a picture database to promote efficient database browsing.

Sai et al. (US 2002/0012526 A1) teach a digital video reproduction method, digital, video reproducing apparatus and digital video recording and reproducing apparatus.

Chao et al. (US 5,723,184) teach a video and audio cursor video editing system.

Klemets et al. (US 2001/0013068 A1) teach an interleaved multiple multimedia stream for synchronized transmission over a computer network.

Pietropaolo et al. (US 6,351,765 B1) teach a nonlinear video editing system.

Ferguson et al. (US 6,064,984) teach a GUI for a computer-implemented financial planning tool.

Venolia (US 6,366,303 B1) teaches a zooming controller.

Wynn et al. (US 6,667,751 B1) teach a linear web browser history viewer.

Hirata et al. (US 6,317,739 B1) teach a method and apparatus for data retrieval and modification utilizing graphical drag-and-drop iconic interface.

Tinsley et al. (US 2003/0043815 A1) teach an intelligent fabric.

Shiimori (US 6,567,983 B1) teaches an electronic album producing and viewing system and method.

Chiu et al. (US 6,452,615 B1) teach a system and apparatus for notetaking with digital video and ink.

Foreman et al. (US 6,628,303 B1) teach a GUI for motion video planning and editing system for a computer.

Jain et al. (US 6,144,375) teach a multi-perspective viewer for content-based interactivity.

Moorby et al. (US 5,892,507) teach a computer system for authoring a multimedia composition using a visual representation of the multimedia composition.

Newman et al. (US 6,154,600) teach a media editor for non-linear editing system.

Rosenqweig et al. (US 2002/0075322 A1) teach a timeline-based GUI for efficient image database browsing and retrieval.

Petelycky et al. (US 6,204,840 B1) teach a non-timeline, non-linear digital multimedia composition method and system.

Inquires

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

The fax numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306 [Official Communication]

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

LVN
Patent Examiner
December 6, 2004

Kristine Kincaid
Kristine Kincaid
Supervisor
Art Unit 2174